DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 704 TM 007 142

AUTHOR Lorish, Christopher; Kennedy, William R.
TITLE Evaluation of a Teacher-Based Change Project: Processes, Problems, and Possibilities.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (62nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Problems; Data Collection; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Change; Elementary School Mathematics; Elementary School Teachers; Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; *Evaluators; Intermediate Grades; *Program Evaluation; Reading Comprehension; *Research Problems; Research Utilization; Self Concept; *Social Environment; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Morale; Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS Cleveland Public Schools OH

ABSTRACT

On the assumption that individual teachers are the primary agents for developing more effective education, the Cleveland Public Schools began a four-year teacher-based change project entitled Planning Educational Environments for Cleveland Children in two volunteer schools. The various evaluators in the project, however, assumed that the funding agency was their primary client, the school administration next, and the school staff the last. Evaluation reports were not sufficiently detailed or specific to be useful to the teachers. Emphasis of reports was on instructional processes and pupil products in three areas: reading, mathematics, and self-concept. There was considerable disagreement on the meaning of self-concept. Resistance by the teachers took the forms of refusing to respond, responding incompletely, or responding falsely. The evaluation process was perceived by the teachers as threatening, because of unrealistic expectations and attitudes toward the administrative bureaucracy. For some teachers, the costs of evaluation were far greater than the benefits. Effective evaluation requires understanding of the political and social context, and flexibility to adapt to that context. The evaluator must consider the individual characteristics of the participants and attempt to reduce their anxieties, while treating them honestly. (CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED156704

Evaluation of a Teacher-Based Change Project: Processes, Problems, and Possibilities

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christopher Lorish
William Kennedy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Christopher Lorish

Cleveland Public Schools

and

William R. Kennedy

Case Western Reserve University

Paper presented at the 1978 Annual Meeting of
The American Educational Research Association
Toronto, Canada, March 1978
Printed in U.S.A.

TM007 142

Evaluation of a Teacher-Based Change Project: Processes, Problems, and Possibilities

Introduction

During the 1973-74 school year, Cleveland Public Schools with the financial support of the George Gund Foundation began a four-year, teacher-based change project entitled Planning Educational Environments for Cleveland Children (PEECC). The basic hypothesis tested during the project was that individual school staffs were the primary agents for developing more effective educational strategies by working as a planning team and by utilizing parent, university, and central administration resources (PEECC, Note 1, p. 3). Planning teams in two Title I elementary schools spent the first year and a half engaged in after-school meetings to define their respective school goals; to identify problems, resources, and solutions; and to plan for the implementation of staff agreed upon instructional program changes (PEECC, Note 1). During the next two and a half years, the instructional program changes were implemented. Staff meetings were less frequent during this period and were for the purpose of solving implementation problems (PEECC, Notes 2, 3, 4, 5).

The essential elements of the project were the school

staff team planning process and the instructional program changes, e.g., diagnostic-prescriptive reading curricula, that resulted from that process. The staffs made these changes to improve pupils' reading comprehension, math computation, and self-concept test performances. This approach to institutional reform was intended to be an alternative to the more typical approach in which a reform is imposed without necessarily reflecting the needs or commitment of those implementing the reform (PEECC, Note 1, p. 2).

While differing in several important ways, this project shared fundamental similarities with the Kettering Foundation's League of Cooperating Schools project described by both Goodlad (1975) and Bentzen (1974). Both projects emphasized the school staff's responsibility for reform and a team problem-solving process as the mechanism for initiating reform.

This paper will analyze the PEECC project from the standpoint of the evaluator's role. After summarizing the purposes, processes, and results of the evaluation, an analysis of the evaluation problems that were encountered will be made; and recommendations for persons evaluating similar projects will be suggested. The problem analysis section of the paper is an ex post facto, speculative

analysis of the experiences and the problems encountered. It is an attempt to insightfully reconstruct particular aspects of our two-year experience. Such an attempt is motivated by the belief that personal insights are often the beginning of truth.

In discussing the evaluator's role, an ordinary usage distinction needs to be made between the term "evaluation" and the term "evaluating" or the phrase "doing an evaluation." The term "evaluation" ordinarily refers to some conceptual plan for obtaining information for answering questions or making value judgments and decisions (Worthen and Sanders, 1973). This is implied in the phrase "the evaluation of this project will follow. . . ." "Evaluation" can also refer to the results or conclusions of the plan that has been implemented, as implied in the phrase "my evaluation of the project is. . . ." "Evaluating" or "doing an evaluation" usually refers to the activities--usually within a social context--of the evaluator while carrying out the evaluation plan. The two meanings of "evaluation" will be touched upon in this paper, but special emphasis will be placed upon understanding the activities of "evaluating" in the context of a teacher-based change project.

Evaluation Thrust

As a conceptual plan for collecting information for making value judgments and decisions, the evaluation plan can consist of many attributes and be characterized in a variety of ways (Steele, 1973). Some common attributes are considered in this section to provide the background for understanding the evaluation problems and recommendations considered later.

Part of any evaluation plan is a description of the evaluator's role and specification of the evaluation's purposes. What the role was and how it was interpreted by the three evaluators who worked at different times with this project is the subject of the present discussion. As stated in the 1974 proposal (PEECC, Note 1, p. 22), the evaluator was responsible for the evaluation design, instrument selection, data collection and analysis, and report writing. The purpose of these activities was to describe in detail what the staffs did, to assess staff progress toward accomplishing their process objectives (the instructional program changes), and to assess product objective progress (pupil reading and math improvement). However, in the Introduction section of that proposal, the project developers additionally called for a rigorous study of staff team planning, specifically the planning dynamics,

the effectiveness of team planning as an ongoing mode of school operation, and the success with which team planning facilitated the implementation of the instructional program changes (p. 4).

In the face of this ambiquity about evaluation purposes, the three individuals who were the project's evaluator at different times during its tenure emphasized the assessment of each school's process and product objectives with less time devoted to the study of team planning. This was a mistake but one that occurred for understandably human reasons.

First, the evaluator during the 1973-74 planning year that resulted in the 1974 project proposal (PEECC, Note 1) did not carry out any systematic data collection of team planning dynamics in the two schools despite statements to his superior that he was. While it is not clear why this happened, informal accounts from project management and participants indicated that it may have occurred for two reasons. First, in order to develop and maintain positive relations with the two school staffs that were anxious, if not often hostile, to an outsider observing their planning activities, systematic observation may have been postponed. Second, as time passed during that year, the evaluator acted less as a neutral observer and more as a planning

participant by serving as a technical consultant on needs assessment, test development and interpretation, etc. The sad irony was that, while the evaluator provided needed technical assistance that resulted in the funded 1974 proposal (PEECC, Note 1), it negated the possibility that he could neutrally and systematically describe the planning dynamics.

Staff team planning occurred during the first half of the 1974-75 school year, but this, too, was a missed observation opportunity. Upon the departure of the first evaluator during the summer of 1974, Cleveland Public Schools began a national search for a qualified evaluator. This was not filled until the 1975 summer. In the meantime, an evaluator with Cleveland Public Schools was pressed into duty, but could not give full attention to the project because of other obligations. By the time the third evaluator was hired, the school staffs were implementing their plans and staff meetings were less frequent and used to support implementation efforts.

In the last two years, the responsibility for evaluating the instructional program and staff process objectives was divided among three individuals, all of whom were under the general supervision of the Director of the Division of Research and Development of Cleveland Public

Schools. The responsibility of the first author, the project evaluator, during the last two years of the project was to evaluate all instructional program process objectives and the reading and mathematics product objectives. The responsibility of the second author was to evaluate the pupil self-concept objective. Responsibility for evaluating the staff process objectives was jointly shared by the project evaluator and the staff of a local university that was in charge of the on-site, staff development component. In the last year, the responsibility for this shifted entirely to the university staff because of the heavy demands on the project evaluator's time made by daily classroom observations in the two project schools and two comparison schools. While each party made autonomous decisions about data collection methods and instruments, continual efforts were made to share ideas, instruments, and information and to coordinate data collection activities in order to minimize time demands on school staffs and pupils.

Another attribute of an evaluation plan is the client or clients and their respective information needs that the plan is intended to serve. Certainly the funding agency, the school administration, and the school staffs all had

legitimate needs for the collected data for making decisions. While the 1974 proposal contained no explicit statements about whom the primary client was, the implicit one was that the funding source was to be served first, followed by the school administration, and then the school staffs. While all parties received copies of the evaluation reports for their own use, the evaluation reports were written to satisfy the information requirements of the funding source. The other clients had to make use of the information in the reports as best they could to answer their own questions. The problems this created in doing the evaluation will be discussed in the next section of the paper.

A third attribute of an evaluation plan is its design which gives the plan its order. The design used for this project as specified in the 1974 proposal (PEECC, Note 1, p. 27) was a process-product one in which project activities were categorized as either instructional program or staff process activities or pupil product objectives. An example of this means-ends design logic would be that the diagnostic-prescriptive reading curriculum and the staff's improvement in using this curriculum would produce increased pupil reading comprehension test scores.

A fourth attribute of an evaluation plan is the pro-

cedures used to implement the plan. The 1974 proposal (PEECC, Note 1, p. 27) called for yearly formative status description reports of the instructional program and staff process objectives that resulted in artifacts whose quality and/or effectiveness could be judged. For example, one staff produced reading-related science and social studies resource files whose quality was judged by administration science and social studies supervisors. Pupil reading, mathematics, and self-concept product objectives were assessed summatively at the end of the final implementation year using a pre-post comparison group statistical design and nationally normed tests (see PEECC, Note 5).

Data collection methods and instruments varied. Locally constructed questionnaires, interviews with project staff, nationally normed attitude and knowledge tests, and on-site observations of reading and mathematics classroom instruction were all used. Often, information about a project activity was collected by two parties using different methods in the hopes of giving greater convergent validity to the conclusions made. In an attempt to obtain detailed information on how project teachers were teaching reading and in what ways their instruction differed from reading instruction in two comparison schools, every regular teacher in grades 4 through 6 was observed by a team of two at least

five times during the last year. Two observation systems were used to obtain information on the instructional and managerial interaction patterns between the teacher and pupils, the types of instructional groupings and materials utilized by teachers, and the amount of time pupils spent in different instructional groups with different materials. Unfortunately, no observations like these were made at the onset of the project that would have permitted conclusions about changes in the instructional methods of project teachers. Details of the data collection procedures are contained in the evaluation reports of the last two years (PEECC, Notes 3, 4, 5).

While it would be nearly impossible to summarize all the conclusions drawn from the information collected during the last two years, some idea of how successful the project was in improving pupil test performance and improving the effectiveness of staff team planning as a change mechanism would be useful (see PEECC, Note 5 for more details). As to the reading, math, and self-concept product objectives, no overall statistical differences were found between pupils in grades 4 through 6 of the project schools when compared to similar pupils in two other schools. Thus, the differences in curricula and instructional methods observed in the two project schools resulted in neither worse, nor

better reading, mathematics, or self-concept test performance in those grades. As to the effectiveness of staff team planning as a means for developing plans during the first year and a half, the evidence suggests that both staffs made extensive plans for changing their instructional programs but that the planning process resulted in conflicts among the staff and between the staff and their principal. Keeping the planning tasks manageable was also a pronounced problem during that period. As to the effectiveness of staff planning in facilitating the implementation of project plans, the evidence suggests that in one school the interpersonal and task management problems that developed during the planning period were not resolved during the implementation period and probably negatively affected those implementation efforts. At the other school, these same problems diminished during the implementation years, resulting in a greater number and diversity of program changes being implemented during the last two and one-half years. Staff planning seemed to be one factor that contributed to the successful resolution of conflicts and implementation efforts.

Thus, as a means for promoting change, staff planning had mixed success, probably as a result of the complex interplay of individual, group, and organizational forces.

Although the school staffs made and implemented plans for changing their instructional programs, such changes may have been necessary conditions for improving pupils' reading, math, and self-concept test performances, but they were not sufficient conditions for such improvement in these two schools. Others in this symposium will analyze the reasons for these mixed results.

Evaluation Problems

An evaluation problem is created when intellectual, social, or physical conditions inhibit the collection of valid and reliable information for answering questions and for making decisions and value judgments. Recalling the distinction between "evaluation" as a conceptual plan for collecting information and "evaluating" as the activities of collecting information within a social and institutional context, it follows that evaluation problems are rooted in conceptual inadequacies and/or existing and changing social conditions. Problems emanating from both sources will be discussed.

Conceptual inadequacies

The evaluation plan gives form, meaning, and purpose to the activities of evaluation. If the plan is poorly conceived, the obtained information will at best be incomplete and at worst irrelevant to the decisions and judgments

needed to be made. In this project, one conceptually rooted problem was a too narrow conception of the client whose needs for information the evaluation was to serve. As discussed before, data was gathered and reports were written to satisfy the demands of the funding source, the school system secondarily, and the project school staffs lastly. It is the authors' contention that this ordering of clients had serious consequences not only for the activities of evaluating but also for the project's success.

The first consequence related to the activities of evaluating was that all decisions about data collection were made from the standpoint of meeting the information requirements of the funding source and school administration. Thus, the collected information may have served these clients well in answering broader questions of the project's progress and worth, but the information was of little or no value to the project school staffs whose questions were of a much narrower type, e.g., "How successful were the worksheets in teaching the main idea reading skill?"

In a project in which teachers and principals were given the authority and support to engage in a planning process to identify their instructional problems and solutions and then implement those solutions, their need for

valid and reliable information was great, also. While the project evaluator during the planning year did assist the school staffs with the collection and interpretation of needed information, no formal information system emerged in the ensuing three years to help the school staffs answer their questions. It is quite possible that this deficiency was one reason the project was not more successful.

The second consequence related to the activity of evaluating was that sometimes the project evaluator became the recipient of both covert and overt resentment and hostility since he was using their limited time (even though they were often paid for it) to collect information for someone else's use. One can legitimately question the validity of much of the self-report information from the teachers who realized it would ultimately be used to make value judgments by others about their work.

Two other attributes of the evaluation plan were its design which followed a process-product logic and the procedures used to implement the design. While the logic of the design could appropriately serve the information needs of any of the three clients, it was used primarily to serve the needs of the funding source. Also, the specification of the design was not detailed enough to provide sufficient

valid and reliable process information to detect operational problems and their causes. Providing the funding source with yearly status descriptions of what the school staffs had and had not accomplished in relation to their process objectives may have satisfied their need for progress information, but it did not help project management and staff to systematically identify and monitor existing or potential implementation problem areas.

Methodological inadequacies

Evaluating involves not only a plan but also methods for doing things, like collecting, measuring, and analyzing (Cooley and Lohnes, 1976). Trying to address questions, like "What has changed?", "What has changed in relation to the proposed changes?", and "How were those changes affecting the staff and pupils?", creates methodological problems that can be summarized by two issues.

The first is the dynamic quality of the implementation process that inevitably modifies the substance of a reform from its original conception. For example, a group of teachers implementing a highly specified, predeveloped diagnostic-prescriptive reading curriculum will modify that curriculum to suit their own particular needs. The degree of modification seems to be a function of both the nature of the reform and the characteristics of those

implementing it. As to the nature of the reform, the highly specified, predeveloped reading program is one extreme, while the other extreme might be an intellectual and behavioral process whose substance and results are frequently changing, e.g., a self-renewing, planning process. As to the characteristics of those implementing a reform, there is likely to be much more modification if the individuals are creative, inquisitive, and willing to take personal initiative and risks than if they do not possess these qualities. The problem this created was deciding at what point during the implementation phase the evaluator should intervene to describe the proposed change. The solution is suggested by the problem. To use a metaphor, a moving picture was needed, rather than a photograph.

A moving picture account of the implementation activities was impossible because each staff worked on implementing five to six major changes in their instructional operations, and the project evaluator could not be everywhere at the same time. In the last year, the strategy was adopted of concentrating on the reading component of the project which had been the focus of the greatest amount of time and work for both staffs. The implementation of this component was monitored through daily observations of

reading classes from October through May. As for the other project components, a series of photographs were obtained by occasional visits, questionnaires, and interviews.

The second methodological issue is the operational specification of the reform. This is nothing more than deciding what should be measured. Making this decision is made somewhat more complicated by both the expected and unexpected modifications that the reform undergoes during implementation. While educational reforms differ, most involve changes in both people and artifacts. More specifically, we are most commonly trying to change people's knowledge, attitudes, values, role expectations, and behavior patterns, and the artifacts they use. The task the evaluator faces is getting project management and/or staff to specify those attributes of themselves and their artifacts that will change.

The task has both technical and political overtones. With the former, the evaluator may be of great assistance in helping project personnel with understanding the meaning of technical terms like "role", "attitude", etc. In this project, the evaluators failed at helping the school staffs understand "self-concept", a term that they all thought they did but really did not. The result was that they did

very diverse things with little measurable impact.

As to the politics of specification, it is often in the interest of project staff and management to be deliberately vague and ambiguous since it is more difficult to be proven wanting when it is not clear what was to have changed. In this project, one of the reasons the planning process was never described during the first year was that the staffs were not willing to have observers view their planning activities. The first project evaluator worked as a technical consultant, not as a process observer. It is quite possible that one of the tacit reasons for not requiring that the school staffs comply with the request for a process observer to view meetings was to minimize as many externally imposed sources of discord as possible on the staffs.

Social conditions

The problems of evaluating rooted in conceptual and methodological inadequacies may be easier to solve given sufficient diligence, intelligence, and creativity; but the problems rooted in social conditions can be more intractable, not only because their solutions are shaped by the aforementioned individual qualities but also by the prevailing group and institutional forces (Getzels et al., 1968). In other words, in order to understand these

problems, it is important to examine the dynamic interplay between the individual--his history, capabilities, attitudes, goals; the school staff--its history, goals, norms, roles, reward systems, leadership and communication patterns; and the bureaucratic school system--its history, goals, norms, reward systems, roles. Overlaying these forces is the project with its goals, activities, and participants' costs and benefits.

At its simplest level, doing an evaluation at least involves an evaluator obtaining relevant information from a project participant by observing or soliciting the participant's behavior. That the participant has a resource (information) not in the possession of the evaluator is both the source of the participant's power and the basis of many problems encountered by the evaluator. One of the important problems encountered by an evaluator doing an evaluation is resistance. Its importance derives from the fact that the honest and complete cooperation of participants is a necessary condition for obtaining useful, valid, and reliable information. While resistance has been the subject of numerous articles (Schmuck and Runkel, 1972; Longood and Simmel, 1962; Charters and Pellegrin, 1973; House, 1975), it is usually written within the context of resistance to innovation, not resistance to evaluation.

While it is quite likely that many of the conditions discussed in those articles are applicable for understanding evaluation resistance, no studies of which the authors are presently aware demonstrate that this is so. An ex post facto analysis based on a two-year, close association with the two project staffs may provide others some understanding for dealing with this problem.

For the purpose of this discussion, evaluation resistance will be defined as the opposition by a participant to the evaluator's attempt to obtain relevant information by such tactics as refusing to respond, responding incompletely, or responding falsely. The behavioral manifestations of evaluation resistance encountered were varied. While the evaluators encountered some participants who refused to provide information or provided false information, the more common manifestations were somewhat different. Complaints, sometimes hostile, about the quantity, types, and scheduling of data collection were often received from individuals and groups. Several data collection sessions for which participants were paid were moderately attended; or individuals would straggle in late to the session. There were some instances of strong initial refusal to allow evaluation observers to visit reading classes. In general, the project staffs were most honestly responsive

to data collection and results when the likelihood was great that the information would reflect positively upon them. The evaluators were viewed at best as a nuisance and at worst as an enemy. Why was this so?

At the level of the individual, the most fundamental purpose served by an individual's psychological processes and activities was the preservation of one's positive self-esteem in one's own eyes and in the eyes of others. This need may have been heightened because the project was expensive and focused upon only two elementary school staffs. More importantly, perhaps, people at the funding level and school system level had high expectations for bringing about dramatic changes in the instructional operations of the schools. Thus, in the face of such pressure to meet others' expectations, illusions were often created when the reality did not fit the expectation. It was not uncommon to observe teaching performances representing project expectations that were typical only in the presence of the project evaluator.

Two related characteristics of the individual that contributed to evaluation resistance were the ignorance of participants of the purposes and methods of evaluation and of the uses of evaluation results. Sarason (1972) points to the absence of "vehicles of criticism" in imple-

menting new organizational forms. As was pointed out earlier, after the first year of planning, no systematic information system emerged to assist the school staffs in monitoring and correcting their efforts. While the evaluators' efforts may have contributed to some learning about evaluation through modeling, no training was provided to the staffs on the methods and uses of evaluation because, in part, the clients were the funding source and school system, not the project staff. Thus, when the project staff was confronted with the unknown or poorly understood, a common reaction was fear, anxiety, and flight. But there was more to it than ignorance or poor understanding of evaluation, for most of the school staff members did know enough to know that the clients were the funding source and the school system. They also understood that those clients would make value judgments about their efforts. Again, then, the individual staff member needed to behave in ways to maintain his/her positive self-esteem in the eyes of those other clients, even if it meant deception.

The assumption made so far in this discussion about the participant is that she/he was committed to the goals and activities of the project. During the last two years, it was clear that the range of commitment and involvement

was large, even though all volunteered initially. For some the personal costs in time and psychic energy were far greater than the benefits. Some participants were involved in project activities but for goals different from those of the project. For some participants, it seemed that attending planning sessions for the money or in-service courses for graduate degree credit were motivating reasons of equal importance--if not greater importance--than the project-related reasons for those activities. Thus, for those who were no longer involved, passively involved, or involved for other reasons, evaluation activities were irrelevant to their goals, were to be avoided as much as possible so as not to waste their time, or complied with only to the extent that it would maintain the illusion of involvement and commitment. Unfortunately, the evaluation staff observed more than one person randomly marking responses to questionnaires.

While these individual characteristics help explain much of the evaluation resistance that was encountered, there were some characteristics of the school staffs as groups that also contributed to the problem. At the level of the school group, the most fundamental purposes served by many of the group processes were the preservation of material, time, and manpower resources and the maintenance

of a positive school reputation. The preservation of resources refers to the additional instructional equipment and materials, aides and special teachers, and paid planning time and college credits that were acquired at the beginning of the project by money from the funding source. The preservation of the school's reputation was multifaceted, depending upon the audience of concern. To the funding source and by extension to the project evaluators since they were their agents, the reputation to be preserved was that the staffs were hardworking, committed, and making solid progress. To other principals and school staffs in the city, it was that they were an elite staff doing something innovative and productive. To the central administration, especially the subject matter supervisors, it was that they were instructionally competent teachers implementing even better instructional methods than any presently used in the system.

One group characteristic contributing to evaluation resistance was the existence of a norm, in one school especially, that central administration staff were outsiders and not to be trusted. The development of this norm was rooted in the staff's history prior to the project. While the norm was very functional in that the in-group-out-group dichotomy encouraged staff cohesion, it meant

that evaluation activities were often met with group suspicion, anxiety, and hostility. These reactions were exacerbated by the first author's role as project evaluator which was somewhat different from the previous two project evaluators' roles. The first operated as a technical consultant, a non-threatening role. The second divided his time among other projects and produced an evaluation document of descriptions of project activities. The third project evaluator was the first full-time evaluator whose purpose was to systematically collect comprehensive information which would both describe project activities in detail but also be used to make judgments of worth. While neither school staff was immune to the implicit threat of the evaluator's role to the loss of resources or reputation, one staff was more threatened than the other. Interestingly, the staff which was most fearful of outsiders and also the most cohesive was the staff that was accomplishing the most and, therefore, had the least to fear. On the other hand, the other staff was bogged down by internal conflicts, was accomplishing much less, and had the most to fear from what could be found out. This staff seemed to perpetrate the most classroom illusions during visits.

A final group characteristic needs to be explored to

understand the resistance encountered. In one staff, many of the teachers opposed the heavy-handed leadership style of the principal. They were reluctant to express their concerns openly for fear of its effect on their teaching evaluations (many were not tenured). That fear response was extended to the project evaluator since he was a stranger, since he was doing an evaluation, and since he was friendly with the principal. In short, he was not to be trusted. In the other school, the distrust existed but for a different reason. In both schools comments expressing fears that the data collected would end up in their employment files to be used against them were frequently overheard.

The length of this discussion attests to the potential complexity of evaluation resistance and its causes. It is hoped the discussion draws attention to the fact that doing an evaluation successfully is more than models and methodologies, statistics and schedules, data and reports. It is a human activity most fundamentally; and the more sensitive and understanding we are about this, the more successfully we can deal with the human problems of evaluation.

Recommendations

Giving advice is always tricky since it must assume a high degree of identity between the original and new situations. Recognizing that the assumption is usually not true,

the authors will forge ahead anyway and make two general suggestions to those who have to evaluate a similar teacher-based change project. Only two are made because they seem to be ones over which the evaluator has the most control.

At the outset, it is suggested that there is nothing more valuable than a thorough understanding of the political and social contexts in which the project is to operate before decisions about the evaluation plan are made. This is directly analogous to Stufflebeam's context evaluation (Stufflebeam et al., 1971), except that the evaluator would use the information for making decisions about the evaluation plan. Hopefully, such understanding of the political and social contexts would result in decisions about the evaluation plan that would minimize problems jeopardizing both the validity of the evaluation and the project's success. Schmuck and Runkel (1972, chap. 10) provide many concrete suggestions about how this contextual understanding might be achieved. Given this contextual understanding, it is not inconceivable that modifications in the evaluation plan for the process plan might be made to better accomodate the varying social and political characteristics of the school staffs in the project. This latter suggestion represents the logic of the trait-treatment interaction

approach to instruction applied to evaluation. Very briefly, the logic is that given the need to efficiently obtain valid and reliable process information, the methodology to do so would vary according to the particular characteristics of the schools and staffs in the project. For example, in a school where the potential for deception is high, the evaluator may have to utilize much direct observation, while in a more positive, cohesive staff other data collection methods may be appropriate. The value of such differential evaluation treatment is that it would provide the evaluator with greater flexibility for dealing with existing or potential sources of evaluation resistance. It would also provide greater flexibility for meeting the differing information needs of the schools if they are one of the clients to be served by the evaluation.

Before this suggestion could become a reality, many political, conceptual, and practical issues would have to be addressed. For example, the evaluator and program management would have to assess the potential political problems and the consequences that might result from treating people or groups differently. Some other issues would be the definition and measurement of the key school and staff characteristics upon which the decision about a

particular evaluation method for a school would be based, the determination of the effects of the differing evaluation methodologies upon the process and product goals of the project, and the determination of the availability of evaluation resources (skilled personnel, time) needed to support differential evaluation treatment.

A second suggestion touches on a theme discussed earlier. Evaluating is a human activity, but evaluation plans, methodologies, and statistics may dehumanize the activity by thinking of people as only "information sources", "data points", or as a "machine" as implied in the process-product manufacturing metaphor. As the discussion of evaluation resistance indicated, the fears and concerns of participants are real to them; and whether they are justified or not, they can have serious consequences on the validity of the data collected. In a project in which the evaluator is in constant contact with the participants, it is crucial that the evaluator sincerely act with respect, concern, and sensitivity to the participants' concerns and anxieties and be genuinely responsive to them to the extent that the requirements of the evaluation allow. Having the participants perceive the evaluator as a sensitive, concerned human being reduces some of their anxiety.

More anxiety can be reduced if the participants learn

about the purposes, methods, and value of evaluation by participating in a project-monitoring system, with the participants as clients, especially if they assisted in developing it. This project did not, and both the project and the evaluators suffered. Even if the same mistake is made again, the evaluator can do much to educate participants by acting as a model, by explaining carefully what and why certain activities are being done, and by drawing analogies between evaluation of a project and a teacher's evaluation of a pupil. However, one cannot confuse the participants in thinking that evaluation and its activities serve only to improve people and artifacts, i.e., process evaluation. One has to also be clear that evaluation is part of a decision-making process in which judgments of ultimate or comparative worth will be made. Not to be clear about this is dishonest and risks the destruction of any good will previously developed by participants. It seems, then, that the potential for evaluation resistance will always exist as long as judgments of worth need to be made. For an evaluator, that is not a particularly encouraging prospect.

Reference Notes

1. Planning Educational Environments for Cleveland Children: Project Proposal. Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Public Schools, July 1974.
2. Planning Educational Environments for Cleveland Children: Evaluation Report (1974-75) and Continuation Proposal (1975-76). Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Public Schools, May 1975.
3. Planning Educational Environments for Cleveland Children: Evaluation Report (1975-76) and Continuation Report (1976-77). Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Public Schools, May 1976.
4. Planning Educational Environments for Cleveland Children: Follow-up Evaluation Report (1975-76). Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Public Schools, September 1976.
5. Planning Educational Environments for Cleveland Children: Project School Operations Full Evaluation Report (1976-77). Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Public Schools, September 1977.

References

Bentzen, M. B. Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Charters, W. W., and Pellegrin, R. "Barriers to the Innovation Process: Four Case Studies of Differentiated Staffing." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1973, 9(1), pp. 3-14.

Cooley, W. W., and Lohnes, P. R. Evaluation Research in Education. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc., 1976.

Getzels, J. W., Lipham, J. M., and Campbell, R. F. Educational Administration as a Social Process: Theory, Research, and Practice. New York: Harper Row, 1968.

Goodlad, J. I. The Dynamics of Educational Change. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

House, E. The Politics of Educational Innovation. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1975.

Longood, R., and Simmel, A. "Organizational Resistance to Innovation Suggested by Research." In C. Weiss (Ed.), Evaluating Action Programs. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972, pp. 311-317.

Sarason, S. B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Schmuck, R. A., and Runkel, P. J. Handbook of Organization

Development in Schools. Eugene, Oregon: National Press Book, 1972.

Steele, S. M. Contemporary Approaches to Program Evaluation: Implications for Evaluating Programs for Disadvantaged Adults. Syracuse, New York: ERIE Clearinghouse on Adult Education, 1973.

Stufflebeam, D. L.; Foley, W. J.; Gephart, W. J.; Guba, E.; Hammond, R. L.; Merriman, H. O.; Provus, M. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1971.

Worthen, B. R., and Sanders, J. R. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1973.